DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 519 SO 000 425

TITLE	Social Studies Curriculm Specialists. Director's Report.
INSTITUTICN	Carnegie -Mellon Univ., Pittsburgh, Pa. Dept. of History.
SPONS AGENCY	Cffice of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.
PUB DATE	20 Jun 69
NOTE	14p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Evaluation, Diffusion, Educational Innovation, Elementary Grades, *Evaluation Techniques, *Institutes (Training Programs), *Instructional Innovation, Reports, Secondary Grades, *Social Studies

ABSTRACT

The director's report is of the institute held fcr social studies curriculum specialists at Carnegie-Mellon University June 9-20, 1969. Fifty-five specialists were selected to attend frcm 223 applicants. The purpose of the institute was to develop techniques fcr the evaluaticn of curriculum projects, and the introductien of curriculum innovation into the public schools. Each morning 12 consultants presented curriculum projects and then a panel discussed the varicus rationales, strategies, and materials used. In the afternoons the participants made their individual analyses after being shown at the start of the institute the proper method by a visiting faculty member. During the institute, time was devoted also to demcnstrating how workshops could be set up in the locales of the participants tc disseminate the techniques learned in the institute. Evaluation of the institute showed that participants felt the first objective was accomplished, but that the second objective met with only limited success. (CWB)

EDO 455519

50

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Director's Report

Social Studies Curriculum Specialists

June 9, 1969 (Beginning Date) to June 20, 1969 (Ending Date)

Edwin Fenton, Professor of History
(Director)

Anthony N. Penna, Assistant Professor of History
(Co-Director)

Carnegie-Mellon University

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

SD 000 425

I. Introduction

The Department of History at Carnegie-Mellon University conducted a two-week institute between June 9, 1969 and June 20, 1969 for social studies curriculum specialists in order to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To develop techniques for evaluating curriculum projects by
   a. examining models of curriculum analysis
   b. examining the rationales, materials, and teaching strategies of ten social studies projects.
   c. examining materials from a number of other projects.
2. To develop techniques for introducing curriculum innovations by
   a. examining successful in-service and pre-service training programs.

Three related changes in social studies education have occurred in the last six years. First, curriculum committees, boards of education, and state legislatures have mandated new social studies content areas in elementary, junior, and senior high school courses of study. Second, publishers and curriculum developers have made available huge quantities of new materials. Third, curriculum research and development projects have devised a variety of new teaching strategies to use with new materials.

Despite these developments, new materials and instructional techniques have not found their way into a majority of classrooms. Most social studies supervisors and teachers have had little opportunity to become acquainted with the experimental work taking place in the social studies

curriculum projects. In seeking ways to disseminate information about these developments, the Department of History at Carnegie-Mellon University conducted a two week institute for fifty-five social studies curriculum specialists representing school districts in 26 states, Guam, and Saipan.

II. Operation of the Program

1. Planning

Periodic meetings with the Carnegie-Mellon University staff including co-directors Edwin Fenton and Anthony N. Penna, and instructor Velvelyn Blackwell, and the institute's administrative assistant, Sven Hammar contributed to the success of the Institute. Visiting instructor Irving Morrissett, of the University of Colorado, was unable to attend these planning sessions. He communicated his ideas and plans to the staff by telephone and mail. Professor Morrissett knew each staff member personally and had served as a visiting instructor in Carnegie-Mellon's NDEA Institute for State supervisors of Social Studies in June, 1967, and February, 1968, and Carnegie-Mellon's NDEA Institute for Social Studies Curriculum Specialists in June, 1968. The prior experience of staff personnel in conducting similar institutes facilitated coordination of effort and lead to the success of the Institute.

Nine consultatnts from eight social studies projects were asked to spend a day each at the Institute. The co-directors informed each consultatnt in writing about the objectives of the Institute and the daily schedule, and suggested ways in which they could

effectively contribute to the Institute's success. The co-directors requested that each consultant make a morning presentation at which time he would discuss his project's rationale, describe some of the materials developed and the teaching strategies used, and pinpoint problems of teacher preparation encountered by the project's staff. He was also informed that a panel discussion involving the consultant and a curriculum analysis team of participants who had analyzed his materials would follow the formal presentation. At the conclusion of the panel discussion, he learned, Institute participants would question the consultant about his project. During the afternoon session, the consultant was scheduled to meet exclusively with the team analyzing his project's materials for about one hour. At the conclusion of this conference hour, other participants would be invited to join the analysis team in questioning the consultant.

Three additional consultants were employed by the Institute to conduct special afternoon and evening sessions. Robert Ciaburri and Mitchell P. Lichtenburg, Co-Directors of the Education Systems Research Project at Carnegie-Mellon, were asked to serve as consultants on computer-assisted instruction. Both consultants would demonstrate to participants new social studies curriculum programs for using computers to teach inquiry skills to secondary school students. The co-directors of the Institute asked Sam K. Bryan, Assistant Research Historian at Carnegie-Mellon and

a social studies teacher in the Pittsburgh Public Schools, to conduct two evening sessions demonstrating to participants ways to use films for inquiry objective in the classroom. Participants gave favorable ratings to all the presentations offered by the twelve consultants. Special praise from the participants, however, went to those consultants who involved participants by demonstrating the project's materials using the participants as students. Half of the consultants used this technique with very favorable reactions from participants. In the future, this strategy of participant involvement should be emphasized when communicating with consultants during the planning phase of the Institute.

2. Participants

We printed 3500 brochures which described the program. Brochures were mailed to all school systems with more than 4,000 pupils, to individuals who requested information about the program, and to all participants and alternates of previous NDEA Institutes held at Carnegie-Mellon University from 1965 through 1968. We received approximately 550 requests for application packets. Each potential candidate received a complete application packet which included a sheet of instructions, one OE 7211 Application for Admission, two OE 7212 Confidential Evaluation Forms, one CMU-1 Statement of Curricular Experience Form, one brochure describing the Institute program, and a self-addressed return envelope. We received 223 completed applications from candidates to fill fifty-five places at the Institute. This large response from

social studies curriculum specialists located throughout the country did not lessen the problem of attracting candidates from metropolitan school systems. Repeated efforts to contact them directly by mail failed to produce a substantial number of potential candidates from large urban school systems. As a result, the Institute received the majority of its applications from candidates in small cities, counties, and suburban areas and a minority from large urban centers.
A selection committee consisting of the co-directors and Professors Velvelyn Blackwell and Sven Hammar of the Department of History selected fifty-five candidates from the 223 applicants. Applications were judged on the basis of a personal statement by the applicant, administrative recommendations, and the nature of the applicant's position, responsibilities, and experience. About seventy-five of the applicants were rated first-rank, which made selection difficult. From this group of seventy-five candidates, fifty-five were judged outstanding and were notified by mail of our decision to admit them as participants to the Institute.

3. Staff

Regular faculty (Edwin Fenton, Anthony N. Penna, Velvelyn Blackwell, and Sven Hammar) and visiting faculty (Irving Morrissett) cooperated completely in attempting to achieve the program's objectives. Professor Morrissett's expert knowledge of curriculum analysis was utilized effectively during the first week of the Institute.

His keynote talk, his work with small groups on curriculum analysis, and his questioning of visiting consultants stimulated participants to ask equally provocative questions about the utility of the curriculum analysis system and the materials described by project consultants. The regular faculty maintained a continued involvement throughout the program. They met with the visiting consultants each morning at breakfast to stress the program's objectives and answer questions asked by consultants about the day's program, participant knowledge of his project's materials, and general participant response to consultants who had preceded him. Since members of the regular faculty worked closely with curriculum analysis teams each afternoon, they were able to provide each visiting consultant with detailed information about the team's progress in working with his project's materials. At the conclusion of the Institute, each consultant received a copy of the analysis of his project completed by a team of participants

The "critical hour" of this short-term Institute occurred each morning as a new consultant stepped up to the rostrum to address the participants. His effectiveness set the tone for that day. A stimulating, rewarding presentation captured the interest of the participants and resulted in immediate returns. A lively exchange of ideas and judgments between participants, staff and consultants followed immediately and continued throughout the afternoon and evening, often spilling

over into other sessions conducted by the regular faculty. We used a number of techniques (see 5. Program Operations) that resulted in a worthwhile utilization of consultants. Co-Director, Edwin Fenton served as the Institute's catalyst. He attended each session, took copious notes of the proceedings, synthesized them and presented a "farewell address" to the participants. He reviewed the strengths and weaknesses of a short two-week Institute and offered numerous suggestions about strategies and materials in the social studies. Participants responded enthusiastically to Professor Fenton's recommendations and suggestions.

4. Orientation Program

Our orientation program was accomplished largely by mail. We mailed each participant an information packet which included the following:

1. Roster of participants
2. List of visiting speakers
3. List of staff, with vitas
4. Tentative program for the Institute
5. Information on housing, dress, parking, weather, initial meeting, preliminary reading, payment of stipends, restaurants, churches, and stores
6. Map of campus
7. Road map of Pittsburgh area
8. Directions for reaching the campus
9. Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce brochure describing the city

10. Pittsburgh Pirates baseball schedule

11. Reprints of two articles (Patricia Pine, "The New Social Studies" and Stevens and Morrissett, A System for Analyzing Social Science Curricula")

An informal meeting on the Sunday evening preceding the Institute provided an opportunity for the staff and participants to meet, for participants to ask questions about procedure, and for the staff to distribute to the participants packets which contained materials from the nine curriculum projects which formed the focus of the Institute.

There was effective communication among participants and staff during the two weeks. Effective communication can be traced to several factors. Participants heard staff members express their points of view candidly and critically and learned that the staff expected others to react similarly. The participants articulated their interests and concerns to each other and to the staff. An atmosphere of informality was cultivated through such means as informal dress, use of first names, and the voluntary nature of a number of Institute activities. Many participants commented that the success of the Institute was tied to the informality and camaraderie between staff and participants.

5. Program Operation

The successful operation of the program required the careful interlocking of several components. The program required participants to prepare curriculum analyses of the nine social studies curriculum projects represented at the Institute. Several interrelated

activities helped participants to accomplish this task.

a. Participants received sample analyses and two articles on curriculum analysis. Professor Irving Morrissett described the analysis system at the first session. A panel discussion involving the regular faculty, and three participants familiar with the system followed Morrissett's presentation.

b. Each participant selected one of the nine projects to analyze. When an imbalance occurred, the staff asked participants to shift to another project. Each group, including a staff member and five or six participants, focused on one social studies curriculum project. During the first week, each group met each afternoon to familiarize itself with the analysis system and the project materials. The staff encouraged each group to develop its own strategies for preparing the analysis. Once the group divided responsibilities among its members, they began analysis of the materials.

c. A consultant from each of the nine projects spent one day at the institute. Each morning he described the rationale, teaching strategies, and materials of his project, and described the efforts made by the project to prepare teachers to teach the materials. His presentation was followed by a panel discussion on the project's materials, led by the analysis group working on the consultant's project. Each afternoon the appropriate analysis group met with the consultant.

d. At the end of the first week, each group decided whether or not it was necessary to continue meeting each afternoon. Some groups decided to discontinue regular meetings in the assigned rooms, others continued to hold meetings until they completed the analysis. By the last day of the Institute all analyses had been completed. Participants, staff members, and consultants received a copy of each analysis.

Participants regarded the preparation of detailed analyses as a rewarding experience. They believed that they had learned a useful instrument for analyzing and evaluating social studies curriculum materials. They felt confident that they could teach colleagues how to use the analysis system when they returned to their districts. Formal work in curriculum analysis also insured precise and effective questioning of visiting consultants. Most consultants looked with favor upon the prospect of addressing an audience and working with an analysis team knowledgeable about specific projects engaged in social studies curriculum innovation.

New teaching techniques, materials, and equipemnt were the focus of the Institute. Participants made an extensive study of the rationales, teaching strategies, and materials of nine social studies curriculum projects. They prepared curriculum analyses of each project. Participants received instruction by regular faculty and visiting consultants on innovation in audio-visual materials, new programs for using computers to teach inquiry, and new materials for slow learners. Two evenings were devoted to innovative films for classroom instruction. Participants spent many hours examining

project materials other than those represented at the Institute in the Social Studies Curriculum Center's Library. They also examined new audio-visual materials, including films, film loops, filmstrips, transparencies, tapes, records, and picture cards. Equipment needed to preview these A-V materials were located in the Center's library.

Most participants agreed that the beginning and ending dates of the Institute complimented their earlier committments to conduct summer workshops for local teachers beginning in July. Unstructured institute time allowed staff members to assist participants in planning for these local workshops. A few participants wished they had m more time to examine materials in the curriculum library. Most participants liked the balance between structured and unstructured time.

III. Conclusions

A large quantity of new social studies materials has been developed by projects funded by the United States Office of Education and by private foundations. Unless effective methods of dissemination, evaluation, and implementation are developed, social studies curriculum innovation may never reach the teacher and students for whom these innovations were intended. First, curriculum specialists need basic information about the rationales, objectives, teaching strategies, materials, and evaluating instruments of curriculum projects before they can become effective agents of change in their schools. Second, they need a forum for learning

through examining new materials and developing new skills for analyzing and evaluating curriculum. The participants welcomed the opportunity to study innovative materials, question curriculum consultants, and join with staff members and other participants in writing analyses and evaluation of curriculum materials. Their energy and enthusiasm was the most important ingredient leading to a successful Institute.

The Institute failed to accomplish one major objective. The brochure stated that one major objective of the Institute was: "To develop techniques for introducing curriculum innovations." During the early planning phase of the Institute, the co-directors made repeated efforts to employ an individual knowledgeable in change processes as they related to training change-agents within the school, and able to recommend appropriate strategies for implementing innovations with mimimum resistance from colleagues. We planned to ask such an individual to make the keynote speech during the Institute's second week. However, all attempts to procure the services of an individual for this purpose failed. All seemed reluctant, for various reasons, to address an audience of social studies supervisors. Some had previous commitments, others believed that one day at the Institute would give minimim direction to the participants. Participants expected that the problem of curriculum implementation would receive systematic attention during the Institute. To meet participant expectations, staff members, visiting consultants, and participants devoted a segment of each

afternoon to discussions of problems related to social studies curriculum implementation. However, the strengths of the staff were more closely related to dissemination of information about curriculum innovation and on training in skills of analyses and evaluation. These two objectives received major emphasis during the Institute. Participants did not believe that this focus significantly weakened the Institute. Participants and staff agreed that in most respects the objectives of the Institute were accomplished.